



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/538,868 | 06/14/2005 | Aleardo Koverech | 2801-138 | 7287 |
| 23117 | 7590 | 12/26/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC | | | WEBB, WALTER E | |
| 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| ARLINGTON, VA 22203 | | | 1614 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/26/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/538,868 | KOVERECH, ALEARDO |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Walter E. Webb | 1614 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,6-9 and 12-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3-5,10 and 11 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/23/2007, and 06/14/2005</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION**Status of Claims**

Claims 1-17 are pending

Claims 2, 6-9 and 12-17 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 10-11 are currently under examination.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I (claims 1, 3-5, 10-11) in the reply filed on November 23, 2007 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 2, 6-9 and 12-17 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3-5, and 10-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-11 and 14 of copending Application No. 11/629202. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the intravenous solution of the instant claim 11 can be a glucose solution.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iliceto et al., (Journal of the American College of Cardiology 1995) in view of Cavazza et al., (US 2002/0002202).

Iliceto et al., teach administration of L-carnitine within 24hrs of onset of a symptom of acute myocardial infarction at a dose of 9 g/day intravenously for 5 days and then 6 g/day orally for the next 12 months. (See Abstract.) They teach that early administration of L-carnitine after acute myocardial infarction could limit the deleterious phenomenon of progressive left ventricular dilation. (See pg. 381, left column, first full paragraph.)

Iliceto et al., does not teach continued treatment of L-carnitine at a dose of 4 g/day orally, intravenously administering L-carnitine specifically within 6 or 4 hours of onset of symptoms, a pharmaceutically acceptable salt of L-carnitine, or that the oral dose given was in the form of a tablet, capsule etc.

Cavazza et al. teach administration of a pharmaceutically acceptable salt of L-carnitine (L-carnitine acid fumarate) orally in the form of capsules, tablets, powders, or granules for treating ischemia, which is associated with myocardial infarction. (See paragraphs [0001], [0003], and [0043].)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to adjust the method of Iliceto et al. to reflect administering L-carnitine within 6 or 4 hours of onset of symptoms and subsequent oral administration at a dose of 4g/day, since this is simply routine optimization. The adjustment of particular conventional working conditions of L-carnitine (e.g., determining result effective amounts of the ingredients beneficially taught by the cited references), is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan. Accordingly, this type of modification would

have been well within the purview of the skilled artisan and no more than an effort to optimize results. The forms of L-carnitine, pharmaceutically acceptable salts, capsules, tablets etc., are also obvious since these forms are well known in the art to be useful in efforts to administer L-carnitine.

Conclusion

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter E. Webb whose telephone number is (571) 270-3287. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:00pm Mon-Fri EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1614



Walter E. Webb
Patent Examiner
AU 1614

Frederick F. Krass
Primary Examiner
AU 1614

